

1 SCOTT N. SCHOOLS (SCBN 9990)
2 United States Attorney

3 MARK L. KROTOSKI (CSBN 138549)
4 Chief, Criminal Division

5 DENISE MARIE BARTON (MABN 634052)
6 Assistant United States Attorney

7 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055
8 San Francisco, California 94102
9 Telephone: (415) 436-7359
10 Facsimile: (415) 436-7234

11 Attorneys for Plaintiff

12
13
14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
15 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
16 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

17 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) CR No. 03-07-70173-JCS
18 Plaintiff,)
19 v.) STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
20 CHARKON CHANSAEM,) ORDER EXTENDING THE TIME LIMIT
21 Defendant.) FOR THE PRELIMINARY HEARING
22) AND EXCLUDING TIME
23)
24)
25)
26)
27)
28)

20 On June 4, 2007, the parties in this case appeared before the Court; requested a
21 continuance for the Preliminary Hearing; and stipulated that time should be excluded
22 from the Speedy Trial Act calculations from June 6, 2007 through July 10, 2007 for
23 effective preparation of counsel. Counsel for the Government and Defendant requested
24 that the Court refer this matter to a Magistrate Judge for a settlement conference to assist
25 in resolution of this case. Further, counsel for the defendant has recently provided the
26 Government with discovery. Counsel for the defendant does not believe it is in his
27 client's best interest for the Court to hold a Preliminary Hearing within 10 days of the
28 Initial Appearance and waives a Hearing within the time provided by Fed. R. Crim. P.

1 Rule 5.1(c). The parties represent that granting of the continuance is necessary for
2 effective preparation of counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18
3 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).

4 IT IS SO STIPULATED.

5
6 DATED: June 7, 2007

/s /
7 DENISE MARIE BARTON
8 Assistant United States Attorney

9
10 DATED: June 7, 2007

/s /
11 JOSH COHEN
Attorney for CHARKON CHANSAEM

12 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

13 Pursuant to the parties' Stipulation and for the reasons set forth above, IT IS
14 HEREBY ORDERED that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the
15 best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial and that time should be
16 excluded from the Speedy Trial Act calculations from June 6, 2007 through July 10, 2007
17 for effective preparation of counsel. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A). The failure to grant
18 the requested continuance would deny counsel reasonable time necessary for effective
19 preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a
20 miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).

21
22 DATED: _____

23
24 Honorable Bernard Zimmerman
25 United States Magistrate Judge